

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Amendments and Support for Same

Prior to this response, claims 1-23 were pending. By this response, claims 1 and 12 have been amended, and claims 4 and 15 have been cancelled.

Amended claim 1 recites all of the features in original claim 4, and amended claim 12 recites all of the features in original claim 15, namely translation of a service request file with an XML format to a problem file with a PDDL format as also described in lines 3-5 on page 14 of the original specification. Accordingly, claims 4 and 15 have been cancelled.

In addition, claims 6, 7, 17, 18 have been amended to positively define the service specifications providing by DAML-S and WSDL according to page 13, lines 4-18 of the original specification.

Because no new matter has been added, approval and entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

Response to Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The rejection of claims 1-3, 8-14 and 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Flaxer (USPN 2004/0162741, referred to as Flaxer) is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Flaxer publication fails to disclose or suggest a method for automatic service composition that uses a translation process to translate a service request with an XML format into a problem file with

a PDDL format and to translate the service specifications with XML and RDF formats into a domain file with a PDDL format as is now positively recited in claims 1 and 12.

As a result of this positively recited feature, the service specifications of the invention can be files with an XML format (when a WSDL standard is used), an RDF format (when a DMAL-S standard is used), or a combination of the above, whereas the service specifications disclosed in Flaxer are defined by a WSDL standard only, without using any DMAL-S standard (ABSTRACT; claims 8 and 17).

Accordingly, claims 1-3, 8-14 and 19-23 are not anticipated by Flaxer and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

Response to Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The rejection of claims 4-7 and 15-18 is under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flaxer as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Koehler (USPN 2003/0085079, referred to as Koehler) is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Koehler publication, like the Flaxer publication, fails to disclose the claimed use of a translation process to translate a service request with an XML format into a problem file with a PDDL format and to translate the service specifications with XML and RDF formats into a domain file with a PDDL format.

As explained above, Flaxer does not disclose any translation process to translate a service request or a service specification into a corresponding file with a PDDL format.

Further, Koehler also does not disclose any translation process to translate a service request or a service specification into a corresponding file with a PDDL format. Koehler merely depicts the situation or state

description in the PDDL (ABSTRACT; paragraphs [0074], [0088], [0165]; all claims), which does not involve language translation as in the claimed invention.

Accordingly, claims 4-7 and 15-18 which depend from claims 1 and 12, are also patentable and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the application are now believed to be in order, and such action is hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue that the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA
Registration No. 33,805

Date: May 13, 2008

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500